

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-25 remain in this application.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8-13, 15-20 and 23-25 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by *Karidis, et al.* (United States Patent 6,229,693).

The examiner has rejected claims 5, 6 and 21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Karidis, et al.*, in view of *Flint, et al.* (United States Patent 6,686,886).

The examiner has objected to claims 7, 14 and 22 as being based on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In view of the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of the above noted rejections and objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC 102(b):

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of **claims 1-4, 8-13, 15-20 and 23-25** under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by *Karidis, et al.* The independent claims are **1, 10, 13, 15, 18 and 25**. Independent claims **1, 10, 15, 18 and 25** have been amended above.

Amended independent **claim 1** calls for:

a display rotatably mounted in the frame to rotate between an inward facing position and an outward facing position relative to the frame.

(Claim 1, lines 5-6) Applicant respectfully submits that *Karidis, et al.* does not teach or suggest this limitation. Instead, *Karidis, et al.* appears to disclose a notebook computer 21 with a base 31 and a lid 33, which contains a display 35 and a device 41 for articulating and positioning the display 35 away from the lid 33. (Figs. 3-7; and column 2, lines 27, 35-36 and 51-52) Applicant respectfully submits that it is apparent from all of the figures in *Karidis, et al.* that the display 35 can only be placed in positions that are comparable to the claimed inward facing positions of the

present application. *Karidis, et al.* does not appear to disclose a position for the display 35 that is comparable to the claimed outward facing positions of the present application. Specifically, articulation by the device 41 in *Karidis, et al.* puts the display 35 in any of the positions shown in Figs. 2-7, none of which rotates the display 35 to the claimed "outward facing position" relative to the frame. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by, is not obvious in view of, and is patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, at least because the reference does not teach or fairly suggest that the display 35 may have an outward facing position relative to the lid 33. Additionally, since claims 2-4 and 8-9 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are not anticipated by, are not obvious in view of, and are patentable over *Karidis, et al.* for the same reasons.

Amended independent claim 10 calls for:

first and second hinges on opposite edges of the display
directly connecting the display to the display holder.

(Claim 10, lines 5-6; emphasis added) Applicant respectfully submits that *Karidis, et al.* does not teach or suggest this limitation. Instead, the notebook computer 21 of *Karidis, et al.* appears to require the articulation device 41 between the lid 33 and the display 35 for articulating and positioning the display 35 away from the lid 33.

(Figs. 3-7; and column 2, lines 27, 35-36 and 51-52) The articulation device 41 connects to the display 35 at pivot point 45 and to the lid 33 at pivot point 47. (Figs. 4-7; and column 2, lines 57-61) In other words, the pivot points 45 at opposite edges of the display 35 only indirectly connect the display 35 to the lid 33.

Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that amended independent claim 10 is not anticipated by, is not obvious in view of, and is patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, at least because the reference does not teach or fairly suggest that the display 35 is directly connected to the lid 33 at the pivot points 45. Additionally, since claims 11 and 12 depend directly from amended independent claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are not anticipated by, are not obvious in view of, and are patentable over *Karidis, et al.* for the same reasons.

Furthermore, dependent claim 12 further calls for the hinges to be disposed on the top and bottom edges of the display. (Claim 12, lines 4-5) However, *Karidis, et al.* appears to disclose that the pivot points 45 are only disposed at left and right horizontal edges of the display 35. (Figs. 4-7) Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that dependent claim 12 is further not anticipated by, not obvious in view of, and patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, at least because the reference does not teach or fairly suggest that the pivot points 45 may be on the top and bottom edges of the display 35.

Independent claim 13 calls for:

a display mounted about the display holder and having two opposing edges and an electrical connection disposed near each opposing edge; and

two electrical paths, each connecting one of the electrical connections of the display through the display holder to the base.

(Claim 13, lines 4-7; emphasis added) Applicant respectfully submits that *Karidis, et al.* does not teach or suggest these limitations. Instead, *Karidis, et al.* does not describe any electrical connection to the display 35, but is silent on this issue. It may be assumed, of course, that there is some sort of electrical connection to the display 35. Without an express statement, however, it cannot necessarily be assumed that there are two electrical paths from electrical connections near two opposing edges, since there are other alternatives. For instance, the entire electrical connection to the display 35 may be made through only one of the pivot points 45 at only one edge of the display 35. Additionally, since the back side of the display 35 of *Karidis et al.* always faces the same side of the lid 33, the electrical connection to the display 35 may be made through a flexible connector (e.g. ribbon, cable, wires) from the back side of the display 35 directly to the lid 33, thereby not even using an electrical connection near an edge of the display 35. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that independent claim 13 is not anticipated by, is not obvious in view of, and is patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, at least because the reference does not teach or fairly suggest two electrical paths from electrical connections near two opposing edges. Additionally, since claim 14 depends directly from independent claim 13,

Applicant respectfully submits that this dependent claim is not anticipated by, is not obvious in view of, and is patentable over *Karidis, et al.* for the same reasons.

Amended independent claim 15 calls for:

a display mounted about the base with first and second axes of rotation ..., the display being able to rotate about the second axis of rotation between opposite-facing positions.

(Claim 15, lines 3-4 and 8-9) Applicant respectfully submits that *Karidis, et al.* does not teach or suggest this limitation. Although *Karidis, et al.* appears to disclose a comparable second axis of rotation for the display 35 between pivot points 45, it is apparent from all of the figures in *Karidis, et al.* that the display 35 cannot rotate about the second axis of rotation between opposite-facing positions. Instead, the display 35 can rotate about the pivot points 45 between a slightly upward tilted position shown in Fig. 7 and a slightly downward tilted position, but these positions are not opposite-facing. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that amended independent claim 15 is not anticipated by, is not obvious in view of, and is patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, at least because the reference does not teach or fairly suggest that the display 35 may rotate about a second axis of rotation between opposite-facing positions. Additionally, since claims 16 and 17 depend directly from amended independent claim 15, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are not anticipated by, are not obvious in view of, and are patentable over *Karidis, et al.* for the same reasons.

Amended independent claim 18 calls for:

a display rotatably mounted in the frame to rotate between first and second oppositely-facing positions relative to the frame.

(Claim 18, lines 4-5) Applicant respectfully submits that *Karidis, et al.* does not teach or suggest this limitation. Instead, it is apparent from all of the figures in *Karidis, et al.* that, relative to the lid 33, the display 35 can only be placed in positions that generally face in the same direction, except for a slight upward tilt or downward tilt. In other words, there are no positions shown in *Karidis, et al.* that face in opposite directions from each other relative to the lid 33. Applicant

respectfully submits, therefore, that amended independent claim 18 is not anticipated by, is not obvious in view of, and is patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, at least because the reference does not teach or fairly suggest that the display 35 may have oppositely-facing positions relative to the lid 33. Additionally, since claims 19-20 and 23-24 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 18, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are not anticipated by, are not obvious in view of, and are patentable over *Karidis, et al.* for the same reasons.

Amended independent claim 25 calls for:

providing the computer system with a display section closed against a base, the display section having a frame and a display within the frame, the display being in a first position relative to the frame;
opening the display section by pivoting the frame away from the base;
rotating the display from the first position to a second position relative to the frame; and
closing the display section by pivoting the frame toward the base with the display in the second position.

(Claim 25, lines 3-10) Applicant respectfully submits that *Karidis, et al.* does not teach or suggest this limitation. Instead, it appears that the only depiction of a display section in a closed position in *Karidis, et al.* is illustrated by the notebook computer on the right hand side of Fig. 1. In this illustration, the display 35 cannot be seen, but it is clear that the display 35 can be only in a position comparable to that shown in Fig. 1 of the present application. It is apparent from all of the figures in *Karidis, et al.* that the display section cannot be closed with the display 35 in a second position relative to the lid 33. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that amended independent claim 25 is not anticipated by, is not obvious in view of, and is patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, at least because the reference does not teach or fairly suggest that the display section may be closed with the display 35 in a second position relative to the lid 33.

Rejections under 35 USC 103(a):

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 5, 6 and 21 under 35

USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Karidis, et al.*, in view of *Flint, et al.* Claims 5 and 6 depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 1. Claim 21 depends from amended independent claim 18. Amended independent claim 1, as explained above, is not anticipated by, is not obvious in view of, and is patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, at least because the reference does not teach or fairly suggest that the display 35 may have an outward facing position relative to the lid 33. Additionally, amended independent claim 18, as explained above, is not anticipated by, is not obvious in view of, and is patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, at least because the reference does not teach or fairly suggest that the display 35 may have oppositely-facing positions relative to the lid 33. Furthermore, it is apparent that *Flint, et al.* does not overcome these deficiencies in *Karidis, et al.*, so amended independent claims 1 and 18 are further patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, in view of *Flint, et al.* Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that since claims 5, 6 and 21 depend from claims that are patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, in view of *Flint, et al.*, claims 5, 6 and 21 are also patentable over *Karidis, et al.*, in view of *Flint, et al.* for the same reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the indication that dependent claims 7, 14 and 22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Dependent claim 7 depends from amended independent claim 1. Dependent claim 14 depends from independent claim 13. Dependent claim 22 depends from amended independent claim 18. In light of the above amendments and/or remarks with regard to independent claims 1, 13 and 18, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 7, 14 and 22 are allowable without being rewritten in independent form.


For the reasons specifically discussed above, and others, it is believed that pending claims 1-25 define patentable subject matter. Reconsideration of the

Appl. No. 10/666,067
Amdt. Dated April 7, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 11, 2005

previous rejections and objections as they might apply to the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

April 7, 2005
Date

Respectfully submitted,


L. Jon Lindsay
Registration No. 36,855
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

L. Jon Lindsay
1857 W. Spring Water PL
Highlands Ranch, CO 80129
Telephone: 720-344-6189
Facsimile: 928-563-4114